

To: Schardt, James[schardt.james@epa.gov]
Cc: Anscombe, Frank[Anscombe.Frank@epa.gov]; Laplante, Elizabeth[LaPlante.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Barnes, Edlynzia[Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov]; Korleski, Christopher[korleski.christopher@epa.gov]
From: Thomas, Amy E
Sent: Mon 9/19/2016 8:43:08 PM
Subject: RE: Final Progress Report of the Parties --- to Battelle

Sorry, I jumped the gun. On closer look, I think the report is ok. Harbour is only used in the titles of Canadian places. Units are US or Canadian depending on whether a paragraph describes US or Canadian efforts. The format for dollars also depends on the context, as explained in the disclaimer in the inside front cover:

“U.S. spelling is used throughout this report except when referring to Canadian titles. Units are provided in metric or U.S. customary units for activities occurring in Canada or the United States, respectively. Discussions of funding levels or costs in dollars is provided using Canadian dollars for activities occurring in Canada and U.S. dollars for activities occurring in the United States.”

The date format (e.g., “March, 2014”) is neither US nor Canadian, but individual preference, I think. We can go with the most commonly used format in the report, which appears to be a comma between the month and year.

Amy

From: Thomas, Amy E
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2016 3:33 PM
To: 'Schardt, James' <schardt.james@epa.gov>
Cc: Anscombe, Frank <Anscombe.Frank@epa.gov>; Laplante, Elizabeth <LaPlante.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Barnes, Edlynzia <Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov>; Korleski, Christopher <korleski.christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Final Progress Report of the Parties --- to Battelle

Thanks for the final edits, Jamie. One quick question. The document has a mix of US/Canadian spellings (e.g., meters vs. metres, harbor vs. harbour), number formats (comma vs. space), and date formats. Our copyeditor tells us we need to consistently use either US or Canadian spellings and formats. Do you have a suggestion?

The other edits are relatively easy to make. We can send you a final formatted version tomorrow morning. However, it will take another day or two to create a PDF file that is fully 508 compliant for posting to the web. While we are working on the 508 compliance, we will send you the final formatted version (not 508 compliant) for your final review, along with a track changes version showing the changes we made as a result of our copyedit. Does that sound reasonable?

Thank you,

Amy

From: Schardt, James [<mailto:schardt.james@epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2016 2:07 PM
To: Thomas, Amy E <Thomasa@battelle.org>
Cc: Anscombe, Frank <Anscombe.Frank@epa.gov>; Laplante, Elizabeth <LaPlante.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Schardt, James <schardt.james@epa.gov>; Barnes, Edlynzia <Barnes.Edlynzia@epa.gov>; Korleski, Christopher <korleski.christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: Final Progress Report of the Parties --- to Battelle

Amy,

Attached is a document with our final edits. Since both this and the previous version are in word, I think you can do a "compare" to determine the new edits.

Once you get a sense of the workload required to make these changes, it would be great to hear an estimate of when we might see the final.

As a heads-up, I believe our entire EPA and ECCC team will give the final document developed by Battelle a final, expedited review before posting (minutes, not hours!). I doubt any required edits would come out of that review, but I'm just saying that so that we can all be ready in case we find an egregious typo or a big block of missing text or something unexpected like that.

Thanks everyone!

-jamie

James Schardt

U.S. EPA - Great Lakes National Program Office

77 W. Jackson Blvd. (Mailcode: G-17J)

Chicago, IL 60604

www.epa.gov/greatlakes

phone: 312-353-5085

email: schardt.james@epa.gov